

2.0

NO RIGHTS, NO DUTIES :

OR,

SLAVEHOLDERS, AS SUCH, HAVE NO RIGHTS;
SLAVES, AS SUCH, OWE NO DUTIES.

AN ANSWER TO A LETTER FROM

HON. HENRY WILSON,

TOUCHING

Resistance to Slaveholders being the Right
and Duty of the Slaves,

AND OF THE

PEOPLE AND STATES OF THE NORTH.

BY HENRY C. WRIGHT.

"THE MAGAZINE IS OPEN, AND THE MATCH WILL SHORTLY BE APPLIED."

Faulkner of Virginia.

BOSTON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR.

1860.

1011
1011
1011

"Sir, to the eye of the statesman, as to the eye of Omniscience, dangers pressing, and dangers that must necessarily press, are alike present. With a single glance, he embraces Virginia now, with the elements of destruction reposing quietly on her bosom, and Virginia as lighted from one extremity to the other, with the torch of servile insurrection and massacre. It is not sufficient for him that the match is not yet applied. It is enough that THE MAGAZINE IS OPEN, AND THE MATCH WILL SHORTLY BE APPLIED!" "Something must be done. Why? Because if not, the throats of all the WHITE people of Virginia will be cut, or the throats of the BLACKS will be cut; * * * for the fact is conceded, that one race or the other must be exterminated, unless slavery be speedily abolished."—Speech of CHARLES JAMES FAULKNER, in the Legislature of Virginia, on the Nat. Turner Insurrection.

181996

W. 181996
301100

LETTER TO SENATOR WILSON.

WHAT IS WELL KNOWN TO HON. HENRY WILSON AND THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

OHIO, Feb. 3d, 1860.

HON. HENRY WILSON :

SIR,—A letter from you to me, through the *New York Herald*, has just reached me. In it you affirm, with great seeming indignation and vexation, that I know some things, which you are kind enough to mention. In answer, allow me, frankly, but with confidence, to tell you and the political party which you represent, what you and they know.

1. "You know" that individual slaveholders, as such, have no rights which any man, black or white, enslaved or free, is bound to respect.

The individual pirate, as a pirate, has no rights. No laws nor constitutions of human device can create for and secure to him any rights; and if they attempt to do so, it is the duty of all to ignore such rights, and trample all such enactments beneath their feet. This is true of all who hold and use human beings as chattels. You cannot doubt that it is wrong to recognize the moral, social or political force of any laws which secure rights to individual slave-breeders and slave-traders. Slaveholders, as such, have no right to exist for one hour; have no right to claim or to expect any other treatment than such as is bestowed on the "most flagitious of mortals"—for such, says Dr. Adam Clarke, are all "who carry on the traffic in human flesh and blood, and

who buy stolen men and women, no matter of what color or country."

2. "You know" that a slaveholding State can have no rights which any individual, or any State, is bound to respect.

A corporate body of pirates, though called a State or nation, can have no rights. It is an organized, systematized banditti, and any individual or State is authorized to destroy it. So, a corporate body of slaveholders, though called Virginia, Maryland, Kentucky, or Missouri, is a self-incorporated body of marauders, and as such, any man or set of men is authorized to destroy it.

Suppose a community of three hundred thousand, on the shore of Long Island Sound, living by kidnapping, and selling the children of New England and New York. It is a self-incorporated body, and called the State of Maryland. They have all the apparatus of an established government, and are recognized by the slave States of the Union as a sovereign State. This commonwealth of kidnappers has stolen children from every family in Massachusetts, your own State, and is rearing them for the human shambles of the South. Has that kidnapping State any rights? None. Is it the right and duty of these outraged parents, arrested by their neighbors, to enter that State with a view to release their stolen children, and break up that band of kidnappers? Would you denounce it as "a mad raid"? No; you would say, "Humanity and religion sanction it."

One million and a half are banded together, and call themselves "the State of Virginia." Suppose that the basis of their existence, as a State, is man-stealing, and the source of their wealth is slave-breeding and slave-trading. The victims of their lusts and their power they obtain from Pennsylvania and Ohio. Has the State of Virginia any rights that Ohio, or Pennsylvania, or any Northern State, or any individual in any Northern State, is bound to respect? The State is a self-incorporated kidnapper, and as such, has no more rights than a midnight assassin; and it is the right and duty of the Northern people, as individuals and States, to treat Virginia as they would an assassin. You and all "who act with you" know that it would be your right and duty to treat Virginia as you would a band of assassins that should call themselves a State.

But Virginia does not kidnap the children of Ohio and Pennsylvania;—she steals and sells her own sons and daughters! She breeds and rears her own children for the human flesh shambles of South Carolina, Louisiane, and Mississippi.

As Mr. Randolph, of Albemarle county, declared in the Virginia Legislature in 1832: "Slave-breeding is a practice, and an increasing practice, in parts of Virginia. To rear slaves for the market is her staple business. How can an honorable mind bear to see this Ancient Dominion converted into a grand menagerie, where human beings are to be reared for the market, like oxen for the shambles? It is worse than the slave-trade, which the good and wise of every clime have abolished as piracy."

True, the ancestors of these Virginia slaves were stolen, not in Ohio, nor Pennsylvania, but in Africa, brought to Virginia, and enslaved. The State has directed her efforts to make the offspring of these kidnapped sons and daughters of Africa her principal source of wealth, and her staple article of trade. She is simply a slave-breeding and a slave-trading State. There is not, probably, a white man in the State, the owner or employer of female slaves, who has not children in slavery; for the child follows the condition of the mother, and the father is never asked after by Church or State. Even the posterity of Jefferson is, this day, in slavery, bought and sold like brutes. Virginia is a huge barracon, whose staple article of trade is, the bodies and souls of her own children. You know that, as a slaveholding State, she has no more rights than a band of buccaniers, and that it is our right and duty to treat her, as Eaton and Decatur treated the Barbary States, those self-incorporated and self-regulated bands of Algerine corsairs.

If the slaves of Virginia were your own children, and the children of your own town and State, do you think you and the people of the old Bay State would prate about "legal and constitutional" means to rescue them? Would they, in the political cant of both political parties, talk of acting "within the Union, and under the Constitution"? No; Natick and Massachusetts would rush to the rescue; and all the New England States would join them, and at once and forever blot from the record of States that corporate ruffian

and bandit, setting at naught and defying all human enactments.

Should an army of fifty thousand, direct from Africa, land in Virginia, to rescue the posterity of her sons and daughters from slavery, and to wipe from the record of States that band of slave-breeders and slave-traders, self-styled a Commonwealth, would you side with the oppressed or oppressor? On which side would be Justice, Humanity, and God? "You know" where they would be; and I have too high an opinion of your moral nature and your manhood to suppose that you would be found in the ranks of kidnappers. It would be the right and duty of the North to take sides with the enslaved, and against the enslavers.

3. "You know" that slaves, as such, owe no obedience, no service, no labor, no duties, to those who enslave them.

Suppose Senator Mason had made you a slave. Could you, by any process, be made to feel that you owe him any service or duty? No law or constitution, by whomsoever made, could create in you an obligation or duty to the man who claimed and held you as a chattel. The relation itself being void, all rights and duties deduced from it are void. **RIGHTS ARE THE BASIS OF DUTIES:** where no rights are recognized, no duties are owed. Slaveholders declare that slaves have no rights. Of course, slaves owe no duties to their enslavers. **NO RIGHTS, NO DUTIES**—is the battle-cry of the "irrepressible conflict."

The assassin has no claims on any one. No man owes, or can be made to owe, him any duties; for he is in a relation that is out of the pale of all law, human or divine. No power can impose on any man an obligation to respect any claim or right, which, as an assassin, he may assume. So, no power in heaven or earth can impose on you, or on any one, an obligation or duty to those who hold and use men and women as chattels.

"You know" that, so far as the laws and Constitution of the United States, or of any of the States, enjoin duties on slaves, they are wholly without moral, social or political force; and that it is the right and duty of all to resist their execution, by such means as shall seem right and expedient to each individual or State. Were your own family, your friends and neighbors the slaves, you would deem any man

unprincipled and inhuman who would acknowledge their binding force, or swear to execute them. Why then do you swear to execute laws securing rights to kidnappers, when the helpless negro is the victim?

That decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, declaring that "colored people have no rights that white men are bound to respect," is unsurpassed in atrocity by any decision that human tribunals ever made. But it will be remembered in the future, and its authors get more than they bargained for. When vengeance shall arouse the negroes, and drive them to seize the sabre and torch of insurrection, as it surely will, then will the whites of the South, as they and their families are victimized to the roused wrath and passions of the slaves, remember that Dred Scott decision; and, too late, learn that, by that decision, every negro is formally and judicially released from every duty and obligation of kindness and mercy towards those who have denied to them all rights, and hold and use them as chattels.

4. "You know" it is the right and duty of slaves to assert and maintain their freedom.

Were you a slave, you cannot doubt it would be your right and duty to assert your freedom, by word and deed; by word, by telling your enslaver that you should no longer be a slave; and by deed, by running away, or by staying where you were, and refusing to work an hour or obey any command, as a slave. It would be your duty to assert your manhood, and no longer consent to live and labor as a beast. As it would be your right and duty to save yourself and family from a burning house by getting out of it, or by extinguishing the flames; so would it be your right and duty to save yourself and family from slavery, either by running away, or by defying the power that enslaved you on the spot. Were thirty millions, called the United States, combined to enslave you, this would not alter nor diminish your right and duty to defy them, and assert your freedom. So, it is the right and duty of the four millions of slaves in the South to assert their manhood, and to cease, at once and forever, to live and labor as chattels. It is the right and duty of the North to recognize and treat them as men and women, and no longer, even by silence or political relations, recognize and treat them as chattels.

"You know," too, that it is the right and duty of slaves, not only to free themselves by running away, or otherwise, but, also, to maintain their freedom after they have asserted it. The first step is, cease to live and labor one hour longer as slaves; the second is, maintain your freedom at all hazards. Were you, your wife and daughters slaves, and you had asserted your freedom by running away, you would not doubt a moment as to your right and duty to resist all attempts, by whomsoever made, to capture and return you to slavery; you, yourselves, being sole judges as to the means to be used in resisting the kidnappers. You would resist those who should seek to re-enslave you, as readily and by the same means as you would defend yourselves against a pirate or an assassin. "You know" you would, and that you would give yourselves no trouble about "political obligations," or "political unions and constitutions." You have led your wives and daughters from the hell and horrors of slavery. You would feel it your duty to resist all efforts to drag them back, whether made by presidents, marshals or judges.

So is it the right and duty of the slaves of the South, when escaping to Canada, to resist all who would capture and return them. They owe no allegiance to any laws or constitutions, and no duties to any slave-catchers, or band of slave-catchers, no matter who or by what name called, who would deprive them of their asserted freedom.

There are two millions of female slaves in the South, subjected to rape and rapine perpetrated on them by their white enslavers. They assert their freedom and the sacredness of their persons, and no longer submit to the brutality of "your countrymen of the South." Those who claim them as chattels, and who would outrage their persons, order them to submit. They refuse. The slave-breeders assail them with the lash and horse-whip. Their fathers, brothers, husbands and sons fly to their assistance. Would you, in Natick, in Washington, or in your electioneering speeches, "express regret and condemnation" at their efforts? You would not. And when I assert that you know and feel it to be the right and duty of yourself, of the Republican party, and of all the people of the North, to "incite them to resistance and to aid them," and that at no distant day you will all

do so, would you consider this "base and dastardly"? No, you would consider it "unjust, unkind, base and cowardly" to say you would side with the ravishers, or refuse to aid the slaves.

"You know" it is the right and duty of these female slaves to defend themselves against the lust and brutality of their enslavers; and of their husbands, sons, fathers and brothers to incite and assist them to defend themselves; and that, too, by such means as they shall deem right and expedient.

5. "You know" that it is the right and duty of the people and States of the North to incite the slaves of the South to assert and maintain their freedom.

Were your wife and daughter, your mother and sisters, slaves, it would be your right and duty to incite and aid them to assert their freedom, and to deliver themselves from the hell of pollution in which they were held. You would regard all laws, constitutions, creeds, and religions that forbade you to do so, as utterly infamous and void; and all who should recognize such laws and constitutions, compacts or religions, as binding, and should swear to execute them, as unprincipled and inhuman.

So, in regard to the wives, daughters, mothers and sisters, held as slaves in Virginia. It is the right and duty of their husbands, sons, fathers and brothers to incite them to resist their enslavers, who violate their persons and consign them to a living death; and of all the people and States of the North to aid them.

"You know" that, so far as the laws and constitutions and religion of the United States, or of the States, forbid us to aid them, they are null and void; and that we are bound to resist their execution, as we would laws and constitutions and religions that authorize and sustain rape, rapine, and murder.

6. "You know" that, in aiding the enslaved to resist their enslavers, it is the right and duty of the Northern people and States to use such means as they would use, or wish others to use in their behalf, were they slaves.

What means would you and your fellow-republicans use to defend yourselves and families against burglars, incendiaries, and highway robbers? The same it is your right

and duty to use in defending others against similar wrongs. What means would you deem it right to use to protect yourselves and families against kidnappers? The same it is your duty to use in defending others. By what means would your constituents, and the people and States of the North deem it right to defend themselves against the efforts of slaveholders to enslave them? It is their duty to use the same to resist their efforts to enslave others.

Slaveholders sought to enslave Kansas. They sent their ruffians, headed by the army and President of the United States, there for that purpose. You, your constituents, and the people of the North met them and resisted, and with Sharp's rifles and Colt's revolvers drove them off, and made Kansas a free State; even H. W. Beecher declaring Sharp's rifles of more value to Kansas than the Bible. This you and your political party approved, and assisted in it. John Brown was the leader of your party in resisting the President, the United States Government, and their titled ruffians. You honor him for resisting the officers and government in their efforts to enslave Kansas. But, when John Brown attempts to do in Virginia what he did in Kansas—*i. e.*, to MAKE IT A FREE STATE—you call it a "mad raid," and visit upon the deed "regret and condemnation."

"YOU KNOW" if John Brown was right at Lawrence and Osawatimie, he was right at Harper's Ferry; that if it was his duty and yours, and the duty of the Republican party, to resist slaveholders in Kansas, and make that a free State, it is your duty to resist them in Virginia, and make that a free State. If it was right to "kill, and slay, and destroy" the slaveholding ruffians in Kansas, "YOU KNOW" it is right to "kill, slay and destroy" them in Virginia. Whatever means it was right to use to make a free State of Kansas, it is your right and duty to use to make Virginia, Maryland, Kentucky and Missouri free States,—laws and constitutions, political compacts and unions, to the contrary notwithstanding.

Thus, it is our right and duty to use all means to free the slaves of the South, which we would use to free ourselves, or wish others to use in our behalf, were we slaves. So, were your "countrymen of the South" to attempt to make a slave State of Massachusetts, you know that you and your

constituents would resist them by arms and blood, and, at all hazards, assert and maintain the freedom of that State. Slaveholders have as good a right to make Massachusetts a slave State, as they have to make or continue Virginia a slave State; and you, your party, and all the people and States of the North, know that it is your right and your duty to use the same means to make Virginia a free State, that you would use to make or continue Massachusetts a free State.

Do you think that Virginia, or any State, has a right, or can have a right, to establish slavery in its own borders? You say, "Virginia has a right to manage her own affairs." When you and your fellow-republicans say this, do you mean that Virginia has, or can have, a right to turn human beings into beasts and chattels, and to be a slave State? Do you mean that she has, or can have, a right to breed and sell slaves; and thus to exist as a slave-breeding and slave-trading State? "YOU KNOW" that you do not think Virginia has a right, before God or man, to hold, breed and sell slaves, and that when, under the phrase, "a right to manage her own affairs," the people of that State infer that you admit their right to turn your fellow-beings into chattels, you do "throw glamour in their eyes," if you leave that impression upon their minds. Political ambition, and a desire to promote the interests of your party, may have greatly bewildered and obfuscated your heart and head; yet you are not a fool nor a knave, but have an enlightened conscience, and a clear perception of the true and the right. Thus endowed, "YOU KNOW" that Virginia has no more right to exist one hour as a slaveholding, slave-breeding, and slave-trading State, than the crew of a piratical ship has to exist as a band of pirates. A religion or government that confers rights on slaveholders, as such, or enjoins obedience or any duties on slaves, as such, or forbids us to incite chattelized men and women to assert and maintain, at all hazards, their manhood and womanhood, deserves the scorn and contempt of every human being; and those who sustain such a religion and government are the deadly enemies of mankind.

7. "YOU KNOW" that freedom cannot be national where slavery is local.

There are one million, four hundred and sixty-four thousand, and forty-five (1,464,045) square miles in the United States. Eight hundred and fifty-one thousand, four hundred and forty-eight (851,448) are exclusively devoted to slavery. Freedom of speech, press and person cannot exist there. Six hundred and twelve thousand, five hundred and ninety-seven (612,597) are nominally, and partially, devoted to freedom. I say nominally and partially; for the free States (as they are called) have pledged themselves not to seek to free the slaves in the slave States, but to protect the enslavers against the enslaved, and to admit slavery to be represented in Congress; have pledged themselves to allow slavery special privileges in the government; and to let slaveholders have political power in proportion to the number of their slaves. Besides, slavery from the beginning has been allowed to rule the pulpit, the platform, the press, the schools and colleges of the non-slave States. Yet you and your fellow-republicans say, "SLAVERY IS LOCAL; FREEDOM NATIONAL" !

Suppose there are six rooms in your house at Natick. Drunkenness has sole and exclusive possession of four of these rooms, and temperance nominally of two. For a consideration, the friends of temperance enter into a confederacy with the drunkards, and agree to protect and perpetuate drunkenness in the four rooms, till the drunkards see fit to abolish it. Not only so, but they also agree to allow the drunkards to drink, to swagger, to babble, and perpetuate their debaucheries in the rooms appropriated to temperance. So the drunkards, daily and hourly, fill the whole house with their riotings, with their filthy babblings and sottishness, and keep all in the house in a state of constant alarm. The temperance men are hooted, tarred and feathered, and in every way bullied and outraged by their drunken confederates, — as they deserve to be, for forming with them such a "covenant with death, and such an agreement with hell." Drunkards may, at their pleasure, come into the domain (the room) nominally devoted to temperance, and, by precept and example, try to convert the whole house into an abode of beastly intoxication; but should the friends of temperance enter the domain (the rooms) devoted to drunkenness, they are whipped, tarred and feathered, imprisoned, or hung. Yet

you say, drunkenness in that house is local, temperance national — occupying the whole house !

This is exactly the amount of your favorite motto, "Slavery local; freedom national." Slavery virtually and absolutely controls nearly one third more of the territory of the United States than freedom. Those who embody slavery are allowed to roam freely over all the territory nominally devoted to freedom, and on the soil of freedom to advocate man-stealing, slave-breeding and slave-trading; to brow-beat and threaten the friends of freedom with bowie-knives and revolvers; and to kidnap and enslave the people dwelling on this nominally free soil. But, if the friends of freedom enter the slave States to plead for liberty, to sustain the Declaration of Independence, and inculcate the duty of "loving our neighbors as ourselves," of "doing to others as we would they should do to us," of "remembering those in bonds as bound with them," and of "delivering the spoiled out of the hands of the spoiler" — they are whipped, imprisoned, or hung. Witness John Brown and his associates. Knowing all this, why do you persist in saying, "SLAVERY IS LOCAL, FREEDOM NATIONAL" ?

John Quincy Adams spoke the truth when he said, "The preservation, propagation, and perpetuation of slavery constitutes the vital and animating spirit of the national government." This fact was manifested in the compromises of the Constitution; and it has been manifested from that hour to this in the administration of the government in its every department. It was apparent in the purchase of Louisiana and Florida; in the annexation of Texas and in the Mexican war; in the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850, and the efforts to execute it ever since; in the formation and abolition of the Missouri Compromise; in the effort of the national government to make a slave State of Kansas; in its efforts to obtain Cuba, and the Dred Scott decision; and, finally, in hanging John Brown for attempting to free the slaves of Virginia, and make it a free State. "You know" all these facts. Yet you persist in affirming that "SLAVERY IS LOCAL, FREEDOM NATIONAL" ! Slavery has sole and exclusive possession of two-thirds of the great national House; and controls the religion, the politics, the education, and commerce of the other third. Yet you affirm that "SLAVERY IS LOCAL,

FREEDOM NATIONAL "I You deceive your constituents and betray their trust, when you tell them what is so manifestly false and absurd.

I am very certain you will, at no distant day, "cease to remember that slavery, in the States, is local, and not national;" and you will learn that slavery is national, and liberty hardly local; that slavery is every where, and liberty no where. If you know it not now, you will soon know that it cannot be otherwise "within the present Union, and under the present Constitution" of the United States. You will soon be made to know, that a dissolution of this slaveholding Union is a mere question of time.

8. "You know" that no power, not God himself, can reconcile slavery with liberty. They are moral antagonisms. As well attempt to compromise and harmonize a lie with truth, as slavery with liberty. The one original, fatal error of the nation is, and has ever been, this attempt to reconcile, under the same government, two moral contradictions: the admission that slaveholders, as such, may have rights; and that slaves, as such, may owe duties. In their nature, slavery and liberty are deadly enemies. Whenever and wherever they meet, each must, necessarily, seek the destruction of the other. The existence of either is a declaration of war against the existence of the other. All who attempt to make a truce between them necessarily lose the power to distinguish between them; as he who tries to reconcile what he knows to be a lie, with what he knows to be a truth, loses the power to distinguish between them.

Whenever these antagonisms meet—be it in domestic, social, ecclesiastical, political, or commercial life; be it in Congress, in the Supreme Court, or in the Presidential chair; be it in Church or State, in the pulpit or on the platform, there must be war, and that unto death, to slavery, or death to liberty. Death to one or the other is the only finality to this conflict. The people of the North have tried to meet slaveholders in peace and harmony, in every relation of life. This is their error and their crime. True to their leading idea, the slaveholders have given no rest to those who profess to embody liberty. So far and so long as the people and States of the North embody liberty, and the people and States of the South embody slavery, undying hostility must

exist, and ought to exist, between them ; and he is an enemy of his race who attempts to reconcile them, or recognizes the binding force of any law or any other principle than death to slavery.

Only on one condition can there be a union between the people and States of the North, and the people and States of the South — *i. e.*, the North must cease to embody liberty in their theories, their life and institutions, or the South must cease to embody slavery. If neither will yield, and each is fixed on embodying more and more resolutely its leading, central idea of life, one of two things is inevitable — *i. e.*, the dissolution of the Union, and the formation of a Northern Republic on the principle of "NO UNION WITH SLAVE-HOLDERS," or a conflict by arms on the field of death. You cannot be true to liberty, without being an irreconcilable enemy to all slaveholders, as such, and to all slaveholding States and institutions. The Republican party cannot be a true embodiment and exponent of liberty, without seeking to overthrow and annihilate all institutions that embody slavery.

All efforts to compromise with slavery and those who embody it, for any cause, is to compound with rape, robbery, and piracy ; is to complot with "the sum of all villany." It is to form "a covenant with death, and an agreement with hell." Such is the American Union, and such you will see and know it to be when slavery and politics shall have ceased to darken your reason, and pervert your moral nature.

9. "You know" that, in this "irrepressible conflict" between the enslaved and their enslavers, it is the sacred duty of the people and States of the North to side with the slaves.

As in a conflict between a band of highway robbers or pirates, and those whom they would plunder and murder, it is their duty to side with the wronged and outraged ; so, in this conflict between the enslaved and their enslavers, every Northern man and State are sacredly bound by their political and religious creeds, and by their allegiance to themselves and their posterity, to the slaves and slaveholders, to their country, to mankind, and to God, to stand by the slaves. In every insurrection or rebellion of the enslaved against their enslavers, our sympathies, our prayers, our words, our money, and our efforts, such as we deem it right to make, ought all to be for the slave, and against the enslaver. This

"YOU KNOW," and teach by precept and example, when you, your family, or white men (as in the case of the Barbary States) are the victims.

Will you say, the Constitution and laws bind the people and States of the North to aid the enslavers against the enslaved? What if they do? In this "irrepressible conflict" between the enslaved and their enslavers, this war unto death between liberty and slavery, "There is no attribute of the Almighty that can take sides with the slaveholders." God and Humanity are against them. In your solicitude to give triumph to your political party, will you obey the "lower law," join the slave-breeders, and array yourself against the Almighty, and against the nobler instincts of your manhood? Under pretence of carrying out the compromises of the Constitution, and of maintaining what you acknowledge to be a slaveholding, slave-catching, and slave-trading Union, and of being true to this corporation of kidnappers, this great, national "brotherhood of thieves," would you do, what Edward Everett says he would do, shoulder your musket, join the slaveholders, and fight against the slaves struggling for freedom? Henry Wilson! "YOU KNOW" you would not; but that, in the death-struggle between the enslaved and their enslavers, which must come, sooner or later, (and SOONER THE BETTER,) you will be struggling for the former, and against the latter. In that conflict, you will embody liberty, and your slogan will be — **DEATH TO SLAVERY!** If, as a politician, you say this is doing you a great "unkindness and injustice," I am willing to lie under the imputation, until the MAN in Henry Wilson shall triumph over the POLITICIAN. When that day comes, as come it will, then you will thank me, in spite of yourself, for vindicating your manhood against the compromising, political partisan, that now, on the eve of a presidential election, overpowers and seduces the nobler and more divine elements of your nature.

10. "YOU KNOW" that it is our right and duty to make our appeals to the "heart, the reason and conscience" of the slaves, to incite in them aspirations for freedom, and to animate and encourage them to be men, rather than chattels.

An assassin is hidden by the road on which you are travelling, with a view to kill and rob you. I know he is there, and that you will lose your life if you pass on. Shall I

make my appeals to you, to induce you to escape the danger, or must I appeal only to "the reason, heart and conscience" of him who is lying in wait for you? The incendiary is about to fire your house, and burn you and your family. I see him. Shall I call to you to awaken, and incite you to escape from the burning house, and aid you to extinguish the flames, and secure the evil-doer, or shall I leave you and yours to your fatal slumber, and make my appeals only to the "reason, heart and conscience" of the incendiary?

Four millions of your "fellow-countrymen of the South" are at this hour in the burning hell of slavery, and, every day and hour, waylaid by robbers and murderers; by those who steal and sell their children, outrage and whip their wives and daughters, and kill the husbands and fathers if they attempt to defend their loved ones against their ravishers. They are held and used as "chattels personal, to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever." Thus are they beset, on all sides, with robbers, ravishers and assassins. Shall the people and States of the North make their appeals to these four millions thus beset and outraged, to vitalize their souls, and incite and help them to escape from that burning hell, and defeat the "base and dastardly" ruffians and their abettors that surround them; or must they make their appeals only to the "reason, heart and conscience" of those who plunder and enslave them?

It is the right and duty of the people and States of the North, "to remember to make their appeals to the heart, the reason and conscience" of the enslaved, as well as of the enslavers. You are conscious that no political compromises, compacts, or constitutions can ever abridge or alter this duty. To incite slaves to cease to be chattels, and to become men and women—this is the sacred duty of the people and States of the North.

11. "You know" it is the duty of the people and States of the North to invade slaveholding States to free the slaves, and annihilate the power that enslaves them.

The right to defend life, liberty and property, even by killing the aggressor, is the basis of every governmental organization in America. It is embodied in the Declaration of Independence, in the Constitution of the United States,

and in the Constitution of every State in the Union. I have heard you proclaim this, on the political and anti-slavery platforms, as the only true basis and object of every government that has a rightful existence; that every human being has a natural right to defend himself, even to the killing of the aggressors, against all who shall attempt to enslave them or their children. You have often said, and do still say, that the man, or set of men, no matter by what name called, nor by what authority invested, who seek to murder, enslave, or rob us, forfeits by so doing all rights, even that of life, and that the outraged individual, alone or by the help of others, may kill him or them, if need be. You will not deny, in Massachusetts nor in Washington, that this ever has been, and is now, your opinion, and the opinion of your party. The existence of every State in the Union, and of the Union itself, is based on the right of the enslaved to resist their enslavers by arms and blood; and on the right of others to incite and aid them to resist.

The people and State of Virginia exist by daily and hourly aggressions on the persons and property of our fellow-beings; by kidnapping, enslaving and selling them as chattels; and by aggressions on the personal property and family rights of hundreds of thousands. As individuals and as a State, they live by theft and robbery; by kidnapping and enslaving men, women and children; and by ignoring and trampling down the rights and endearments of husband and wife, parent and child, brother and sister.

If all highway robbers, midnight assassins, or pirates, or all organized bands of such marauders and desperadoes, have forfeited all rights, and if any man or set of men has a right to exterminate them, then, you being witness, have slaveholders and slaveholding States forfeited all rights, and the people and States of the North have a right to exterminate them on their own territory, or wherever they may exist. Do you deny that human beings have a right to "kill, slay and destroy" all who seek to enslave them, or to continue them in slavery? You do not; it is the cherished or fixed law of your life. As a Senator, as a Republican, as a man, a husband, father, and brother, you cherish it as your own, and as the right of every human being, to exterminate from the face of the earth all who would kidnap and enslave them,

their children, their friends, neighbors or fellow-beings, whether they act as individuals, or in combinations, called States or nations.

The State of Virginia, as an organized community of kidnappers and slave-traders, as a band of American corsairs, covers a territory of sixty-one thousand square miles. This day it claims, holds and uses half a million of our fellow-beings as chattels—every one of whom you acknowledge to have been born free as you were, and with the same God-given right to liberty and the pursuit of happiness. They were kidnapped and enslaved by that self-constituted and self-incorporated American corsair, styled Virginia. You admit it is the right and duty of those enslaved fellow-beings, so outraged in all their property, personal and family relations and rights, to resist their enslavers and ravishers, and, if need be, exterminate them, to effect their deliverance. You admit, too, it is their right to call on their fellow-beings to assist them, and that it is the right and duty of all of human kind, so far as they have the power and opportunity, to go to their rescue, and annihilate the piratical power that crushes them. Why do you pretend in Congress, or any where, that you do not cherish and that you never uttered these sentiments? It is "mean and dastardly" to do so. You are recreant to your soul's most cherished convictions, and a traitor to Humanity and to God, when you deny that these are your sentiments, and of the Republicans generally.

Were these five hundred thousand slaves of Virginia taken from Ohio, you acknowledge it would be the right and duty of the people and State of Ohio to invade—march into—the territory of the enslavers, and rescue their sons and daughters from the rape, rapine and outrages which that slaveholding State perpetrates upon them. And if Ohio were not sufficient to accomplish their rescue, and sweep from the earth that piratical State, and she should appeal to Massachusetts for help, would you doubt as to the right and duty of yourself and your constituents to aid Ohio? You would not. Or, if ten thousand from Africa should invade Virginia, to rescue her children from slavery, and should appeal to Massachusetts for help, where would you and the Old Bay State be found? Where Justice, Humanity, and God are; on the side of the invaders.

INVASION, INVADERS, indeed ! So, if Gov. Wise had kidnapped your wife and daughter, and had taken them to Virginia to grace his harem, or to sell them to New Orleans, and you and Massachusetts rushed to their rescue, and did rescue them by annihilating the kidnapper, and the band that sustained him, you are the invaders, are you ? You know better ; you are not a fool ; your heart and head assure you that you are acting purely on the defence, and that the kidnapper and his band are the invaders, the aggressors. So, when John Brown and his companions entered the territory of Virginia, to rescue their fellow-beings from slavery, and to destroy the power that enslaves them, you being witness, the Republican party being witness, and all the people and States of the North being witnesses, acted purely on the defensive, according to the universally received opinion of defensive war. Is Massachusetts the aggressor or invader, (in a bad sense,) when, by her official agents, she enters the farm or house of a murderer, and arrests him, or of a thief and robber, and secures him, and recovers the stolen property ? You admit she acts purely in defence. So, when Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and Iowa enter the adjacent slave States of Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky and Missouri, to rescue their kidnapped sons and daughters, they but act on the defensive — you and the entire nation being witnesses. So, when obedient to the call of Humanity, the people and States of the North enter those slaveholding States to rescue their fellow-beings from slavery, and destroy the power that enslaves them, they do but act in defence of themselves, their children, and our common humanity, against organized bands of marauders and pirates.

I do you no wrong, but simply justice, when I say, you do approve of invasion — of *armed* invasion of the slaveholding States, with a view to free the enslaved, and to annihilate the power that enslaves them. You do but stultify yourself, and make yourself contemptible in your own eyes, before your own constituents, and before the slaveholders themselves, when you assert that you do not approve such invasions. You hold to *armed* protection to life, liberty and property. I hold you bound to fidelity to your own law of life. You deservedly become an object of pity or contempt when you so indignantly cry out against me, for

thus asserting that you are and will be true to yourself.

While, as a MAN, you know, and, by word and deed, inculcate the above specified propositions as true, as a REPUBLICAN, you deny them; and strenuously and persistently maintain that, within certain geographical lines, called her State boundaries, Virginia has a right, daily and hourly, to wage an inhuman, exterminating and aggressive war against Humanity; and you have promised, not only not to interfere yourself, but, also, to do all in your power to prevent any individual or State, outside of those boundaries, from interfering to protect our common nature from these outrages. As a REPUBLICAN, you concede to Virginia, (and to every slave State,) any where and every where on the sixty-one thousand square miles over which she holds sway, to invade all property, personal and family rights, and outrage every relation and endearment of life,—to seize, claim, hold and use, as beasts and chattels, our innocent and helpless fellow-beings,—while you deny to all living outside of those State boundaries the right to go in, and protect them against their enslavers.

You are passing your neighbor's house. You hear a cry for help, and know that rape, rapine and murder are being perpetrated within. An agonizing cry comes to your ears. As a MAN, your heart and soul respond, and prompt you to rush to the rescue; but, as a REPUBLICAN, you say, "The family that lives in that house have a right to manage their own affairs; within any and every room in that house, they have a right to commit rape, rapine, and murder, *and to get their victims where they please*, and I have no right to interfere; and if I do, it will be the means of defeating the Republican party. Besides, I am bound not to interfere to protect those victims by my political obligations as a REPUBLICAN Senator. I will, therefore, pass by on the other side, and leave those who have fallen among ruffians and murderers to their fate."

So, Virginia seizes men and women, wherever and whenever she pleases, in Ohio, Massachusetts, or Guinea, drags them into her own dominion, and there perpetrates every possible outrage upon them; and you, Henry Wilson, as a REPUBLICAN, consent to stand sentinel to prevent any in-

dividual or State beyond Virginia from entering in, to deliver those victims, and put a stop to those outrages. You denounce all as "invaders," as guilty of "robbery, plunder, treason, anarchy, and murder," who would go into Virginia to rescue those innocent and helpless victims of lust and murder.

Mark ! you do not stipulate *where* Virginia shall get her victims. You leave that to be settled by herself. So, she may get them in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, or Liberia ; all the same to you, as a REPUBLICAN. You have no more right to interfere to rescue the victims she gets from Natick and Massachusetts, than those she gets from Africa.

Thus you, as a REPUBLICAN, allow Virginia the right to invade Humanity, but you will not allow the people and States of the North to protect their fellow-beings against her bloody and murderous raid. You threaten to hang all who shall dare to go into Virginia, — even if it be to rescue their own children and friends from the lust and brutality of their ravishers and murderers. Thus the REPUBLICAN is above the MAN ; the unprincipled, compromising politician is allowed to triumph over the godlike heir of immortality ! What a perversion — what a fall — is there ! The naturally generous, humane, and noble MAN sunk in the cowardly, scheming, sneaking, crawling, loathsome politician ! A child of God merged in the spawn of a slave-breeding, slave-hunting, slave-trading political Union !

Finally, "YOU KNOW" that "Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God," and that it is the right and duty of the enslaved to resist their enslavers, and that it is the right and duty of the people and States of the North to incite (to "arouse," "animate," "encourage") them to resistance, and to aid them in it.

I affirm that you know these things, because (1) you are a man ; (2) you are a son and a brother, a husband and a father ; (3) you were born and educated in New Hampshire ; (4) you believe in the self-evident truth that "all men are created free and equal," and "in doing to others as you would that they should do to you" ; (5) I have heard and read your speeches in Congress, and on the political and anti-slavery platforms ; (6) you are not a fool.

As to the meeting in Natick, Nov. 20th, 1859, you are

certain that, at its opening, it was stated that the object of it was, *not a lecture*, but a discussion of a resolution, and a request was made to the meeting to appoint a chairman, to regulate the discussion. One was appointed. After I had offered and spoken on the resolution, affirming "the right and duty of the slaves to resist their masters, and the right and duty of the people of the North to incite them to resistance, and to aid them in it," I gave way for you and others to speak, and urged *you* (I think, by name) and others to give your opinion for or against it. There was not, probably, a man in that assembly, who would not have been glad to hear you, whatever may have been your opinions. These things you and all that were present know. I had supposed it was stated in the public notice, that the evening meeting was called for a discussion. But that alters not the character of the meeting. It was a meeting to discuss a resolution, the substance of which was named in the published, printed notice, you and the printer being witnesses. All these things "**YOU KNOW.**" In saying this, I do you no "injustice" and no "unkindness." On the contrary, I think I should do a great wrong to all that is pure, noble and godlike in your nature as a man, a husband, a father, a son, a brother, and a believer in the Declaration of Independence, in the Constitution of Massachusetts, and the teachings, spirit and life of Jesus, were I to assert that you do not know; or, that knowing, you would ignore, in your life, the above named eleven propositions. I could not assert that you do not recognize them as self-evident truths, without pre-supposing that you were *non compos mentis*, or that your moral constitution has been utterly subverted by political compromises, and by your efforts to harmonize your duties as a man, with your duties as a politician and an American citizen.

Jefferson said, "I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just, and that his justice cannot sleep forever; that an exchange of situations between the enslaved and their enslavers is among possible events; and that it may come by a supernatural influence — for there is not an attribute of the Almighty which can take sides with the enslavers against the enslaved." There spoke a prophet; and his prophecy may be actualized sooner than any of us dream; for there are tens of thousands in the North who think and

feel that slaveholders, as individuals or as States, can have no rights, and that it is the right and duty of the people and States of the North to enter Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, or any slave State, and "deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the spoiler," and to compel the slaveholders to cease their atrocities. It cannot be unknown to you that there are many John Browns all over the North, and that they are preparing to invade (if you wish so to call it) the territory of kidnappers, release their victims, and compel them to cease their piratical assaults on our common humanity, as Eaton and Decatur, under the authority of the United States, invaded the bands of Algerine corsairs, called Barbary States, to deliver their victims, and compel them to desist from their outrages.

There are but two sides in this conflict to break up those kidnapping, piratical hordes of the South, called States. You and the Republicans must join the enslaved or the enslavers. You must fight for liberty or slavery—for the pirates or their victims. You cannot, in this warfare, pray, "Good Lord, and good devil!" You must be wholly for one or the other. I place you on the side of the enslaved, of liberty, and of God. Because I do so, you are "surprised and pained," and insist that I place you, and the political party with which you act, "in a false position before the country"!! God is ever inciting slaves to resist their enslavers. In the depths of their souls, he is ever inciting them to insurrection, rebellion, treason, and resistance against all who would hold and use them as chattels. I place you on the side of God, of Jefferson, Washington, Warren, Franklin, Hancock, the Adamses, Patrick Henry, Madison, John Randolph, and the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States and of all the States, (for they all, without exception, inculcate the right and duty of resistance to tyrants, and of defence against slavery;) and you indignantly assert that I "place you in a false position," and do you and the Republican party "a great wrong"!

Jefferson called the traffic in human beings "a piratical warfare," an "execrable commerce," and those who buy and sell slaves he styles "African corsairs." I place you in sympathy with those who seek to annihilate this "execrable, piratical commerce," and to resist these "corsairs,"

and you say, "I wantonly misrepresent you." This was the extent of John Brown's offending; no more, no less. You regard it as "a personal unkindness" to be placed in sympathy with him and his associates, in their efforts to put a stop to a traffic so inhuman and so atrocious. When the night of political partizanship shall have been scattered before the rising day and bright effulgence of your manhood (as it certainly will be) — when you shall feel that it is more noble to be a man than a Republican Senator or an American citizen — and when you shall come to feel that no political or ecclesiastical party, constitution, creed, or institution is worth preserving, if it cannot exist without enslaving man — then will you feel proud to be placed beside John Brown and his comrades, in their efforts to break up that band of "African corsairs," called the "State of Virginia," and to deliver from their piratical power the crushed, helpless and innocent victims of their brutality. You will then see the truth of the motto — NO RIGHTS, NO DUTIES; — and that no slaveholder, as such, has any rights, and that no man owes him any duties, except to compel him to cease to steal and enslave men, and to let the oppressed go free. One slaveholder says, "The time must come when the enslaved and their enslavers must join in the death-struggle"; and another says, when that hour comes, "God and Humanity will be on the side of the enslaved." That death-struggle is upon us. In ranking you on the side of the enslaved, will you say, "it is my purpose to deceive"? Not long will you say that.

You not only object to being considered as in sympathy with Brown and his associates, in their efforts to free slaves, and overthrow all self-constituted and self-incorporated kidnapers, like Virginia, but you insist that the people of Massachusetts and of the North, generally, are on the side of the Virginia corsairs. You say that "when Massachusetts requires you to uphold the doctrine, that it is the right and duty of slaves to resist their masters, and the right and duty of the people and States of the North to incite them to resistance, and to aid them in it, there will be a vacant chair for them to fill in the Senate of the United States." It was not wise nor manly in you to utter this threat. Your seat will soon be vacant, any how; and it will then be seen

whether a man will be allowed to fill it who considers it a shame and a disgrace to be classed with those who deem it their right and duty to do what they can to break up those combinations of American corsairs, known over the world as slaveholding, slave-breeding, slave-trading and slave-driving States; and who endeavor to abolish the practice of stealing and selling children, of whipping and outraging women, and of turning men, women and children into marketable commodities, and by invading the domain of those who live by rapc and rapine, and by every conceivable sin and crime against God and man, to rescue their victims from their cruel and bloody hands. If, in this death-struggle between the enslaved and enslavers, you side with the latter, you will assuredly have leave, at no distant day, to rusticate at Natick a long time.

The slave-drivers call you and your political party to account for endorsing and circulating "Helper's Impending Crisis of the South." Republicans, in and out of Congress, have been trying to parry the charge. But their efforts to exculpate themselves have been as fruitless, as they are paltry and cowardly. That book, not merely the Compend, but the original, with all its brilliant and fiery appeals to the non-slaveholding whites of the South, to arise and deliver themselves from the wrongs and outrages slaveholders are heaping upon them, is become the text book of Republicans. Hear Helper. He says—"We demand our rights, nothing more, nothing less. It is for you (the slaveholders) to decide whether we are to have justice, peaceably, or by violence; for whatever consequences may follow, we are determined to have it, one way or the other. Do you aspire to become the victims of white non-slaveholding vengeance by day, and of barbarous massacre by negroes at night? Would you be instrumental in bringing upon yourselves, your wives, and your children, a fate too horrible to contemplate?" "Now, sirs, you must emancipate them, (the slaves,) speedily emancipate them, or we will emancipate them for you." "Small-pox is a nuisance; mad dogs are a nuisance; slaveholders are a nuisance, and so are slave-breeders; it is our business, nay, it is our imperative duty, to abate nuisances; we propose, therefore, to exterminate this catalogue from beginning to end." No wonder that

slaveholders howl and gnash their teeth over this "Impending Crisis," and over the Republicans who endorse and circulate it ! I know that, to tens of thousands of Republicans, this book, without abridgement, is become an infallible rule of faith and practise, with regard to their treatment of slaveholders.

"This (says Helper) is the outline of our scheme for the abolition of slavery in the Southern States." It is contained in the following propositions : —

1st. Thorough Organization and Independent Political Action on the part of the Non-Slaveholding whites of the South.

2d. Ineligibility of Slaveholders — Never another vote to the Trafficker in Human Flesh.

3d. No Co-operation with Slaveholders in Politics — No Fellowship with them in Religion — No Affiliation with them in Society.

4th. No Patronage to Slaveholding Merchants — No Guestship in Slave-waiting Hotels — No Fees to Slaveholding Lawyers — No Employment of Slaveholding Physicians — No Audience to Slaveholding Parsons.

5th. No Recognition of Pro-Slavery Men, except as Ruffians, Outlaws, and Criminals.

6th. Abrupt Discontinuance of Subscription to Pro-Slavery Newspapers.

7th. The Greatest Possible Encouragement to Free White Labor.

8th. No more Hiring of Slaves by Non-Slaveholders.

9th. Immediate Death to Slavery, or if not immediate, unqualified Proscription of its Advocates during the Period of its Existence.

10th. A Tax of Sixty Dollars on every Slaveholder for each and every Negro in his Possession at the present time, or at any intermediate time between now and the 4th of July, 1863.

11th. An additional Tax of Forty Dollars per annum, to be levied annually, on every Slaveholder, for each and every Negro found in his possession after the 4th of July, 1863 — said Money to be paid into the hands of the Negroes so held in Slavery, or, in cases of death, to their next of kin, and to be used by them at their own option.

The time must come when the outraged and insulted non-slaveholding whites of the South will side with the slaves against their enslavers. Let slaveholders prepare for that, for it is at hand. Why lull them into security by promising to protect them against "domestic violence" ? You do but betray them to their destruction.

In conclusion, I would say, slavery is the most efficient and vigilant educational institution in the nation. SLAVEHOLDERS, SLAVE-BREEDERS, SLAVE-TRADERS AND SLAVE-DRIVERS are the teachers ; four millions of slaves, and as many

non-slaveholding whites, are the pupils. What are these eight millions taught? Whatever it is, "YOU KNOW," all know, that they would be justified in applying their teachings to their instructors. Slaveholders have no right to complain when the slaves apply the lessons they have been taught, respecting the rights of property and person, to their teachers.

A boy is entrusted to me to be educated. I have the absolute control of his intellectual, moral and social training. I teach him it is right to steal horses, clothes and money, and will allow none to teach him otherwise. As he grows up, has he not a right to steal my horses, clothes and money? Is my complaint entitled to a hearing, before any tribunal, if I accuse him? I teach him it is right to tie up men and women, and whip them thirty-nine or five hundred lashes on the bare back; that it is right to steal babies and children, and sell them as slaves; and to tear wives from husbands, daughters from fathers, sisters from brothers, commit rape and every outrage upon them, and consign them to prostitution. He grows up, and practises these lessons on me, and on those dear to me. Do I deserve any pity? Will not you, will not all say, SERVED HIM RIGHT? I sowed the wind, I justly reap the whirlwind. I would allow none to teach him better and purer lessons. I planted in his soul the seeds of all crimes against person and property. It is but just that he should practice upon me and mine, in fullest measure, the crimes and outrages I and mine had taught him to perpetrate.

All slaves are taught, by the precept and example of slaveholders, to violate all personal and property rights; and to trample on all conjugal, parental, filial, fraternal, social, religious and civil rights. Day by day, and hour by hour, the slaves, and the non-slaveholding whites, are taught that theft, robbery, rape, rapine, adultery, incest and murder are right. By the precept and example of their teachers, they learn that any and every conceivable cruelty and outrage upon property, person and life are right; and that they may all be practised to gratify the avarice, passions and pleasure of the perpetrators.

Go tell these slave-breeders and slave-drivers that, when the slaves shall bid defiance to their enslavers, and insurrection, massacre, murder, rape and rapine cover the South,

and the cries of the white victims of the slaves' vengeance arise for mercy, the slaves and their friends, the non-slaveholding whites, are only practising on their teachers the lessons they so faithfully and diligently taught them. 'The slaves of Governor Wise have as good a right to give him one hundred lashes on the bare back, as he has to whip them; they have as good a right to subject his wife and daughters to their passions, as he has to subject theirs to his. They practise on him and his the only lessons he would allow them to learn. Let the slaveholders and slaveholding States prepare to receive, in themselves, the full measure of the wrongs and outrages which they have taught to and practised upon their slaves. For "God is just, and his justice cannot sleep forever; and an exchange of situations between the enslaved and the enslavers is an event" which, at any moment, may occur. Henry Wilson! warn the slaveholders to escape, by *repentance*, "the Impending Crisis," the day of hot wrath and vengeance, that is before them, and thus clear your soul of their blood!

HENRY C. WRIGHT.

APPENDIX.

LETTER FROM HON. HENRY WILSON.

NATICK, Mass., Dec. 27th, 1859.

MR. HENRY C. WRIGHT :

SIR, — On my way to Washington, I read your letters to John Brown and Gov. Wise, concerning a resolution passed at a meeting in this town, to the effect that “it is the right and duty of the North to incite slaves to resistance, and to aid them in it.” In your letters you said that, “although a United States Senator and a United States Postmaster were present, yet not a voice was raised against it by them, nor by any one else.” I was surprised and pained at this act of injustice on your part, this wanton attempt to place me in a false position before the country, a position in sympathy with a doctrine my heart and judgment alike condemn. Sir, when you referred to me in your letters, you knew that I had no sympathy whatever with the sentiment that “it is the right and duty of the North to incite slaves to resistance, and to aid them in it.” When you associated my name with the action of yourself and a few other persons in that meeting who generally concur with you in sentiment, you knew you were doing an act of injustice ; that your words would be used to excite, mislead and deceive those already excited, misled and deceived. Yes, sir, you knew those words would place me in a false position — that they would be used to inflame the passions and the prejudices of the people of the South against me, and against those with whom I act, and against the cause we advocate. I have no words to characterize this act of personal unkindness and of wrong towards one who has never wronged you.

When called upon in the Senate to explain my position in the meeting which passed your resolution, I did so without casting any reflections on you, who had so wantonly misrepresented me. Every fair-minded man present at that meeting will admit the correctness of what I said in the Senate concerning the passage of your resolution and the action of the meeting. Mr. J. B. Mann, a gentleman of intelligence, who was at the meeting, in a communication in the *Boston Journal*, says:—

“The meeting was not properly a meeting of the citizens of Natick, called for the purpose of expressing their opinion, but was notified in the usual manner of meetings called by itinerant lecturers who wish to speak to the people. These meetings are quite common, and are attended by all classes of men—friends, opponents and the indifferent, who usually go and hear in silence, and let the lecturer have his say unmolested.

At the meeting referred to, Mr. Wright offered a resolution to the effect ‘that resistance to tyrants is obedience to God,’ and therefore the slaves should be incited to resist their masters. He spoke an hour and forty minutes, and explained the meaning of his resolution to be, not armed and forcible resistance, but resistance by moral, religious, social and commercial means, to make slavery unpopular and unprofitable. But very few voted on the resolution, and no one spoke but Mr. Wright.

As Gen. Wilson had addressed a large meeting in the same place only a few evenings before, and had given his views at length and with much explicitness, condemning the action of John Brown in the strongest manner, he probably did not deem it necessary to depart from his usual custom of listening in a quiet way, and let those who hired the hall do as they pleased, and take the responsibility.

The resolution of Mr. Wright, as interpreted by him, contained nothing but a simple expression of opposition to slavery by all proper and legitimate means, but it was artfully drawn by Mr. Wright, so as to convey to those who did not hear his explanations a meaning of a different character, doubtless with a view of increasing the alarm and excitement now prevailing in the South. Whatever may be the sins of Gen. Wilson in the matter of slavery, it is not true that he has approved the act of Brown, either in public or in private, but has uniformly deplored and condemned it.”

Not content with the wrong done me in your letter to Governor Wise and John Brown, you have, in a letter addressed to me, which I find in the *New York Herald* of the 24th inst., attempted to sustain your original act of misrepresentation. Sir, this act of injustice, this deliberate effort to asso-

ciate my name with the sentiment embodied in your resolution, and to hold me responsible for the acts of a meeting in which I was a mere spectator, fills me with amazement. It being your purpose to deceive, it does not surprise me that you should have commenced your letter to me with an untruth, a palpable falsehood. In the first sentence you say that I was called upon "to give an account to the slave-drivers for attending a meeting to discuss a resolution affirming the right and duty of slaves to resist their masters, and the right and duty of the North to aid them in it." This statement is untrue, and you knew when you penned it that it was untrue. You had an object to gain, and that object was to raise a doubt in regard to the correctness of what I said in the Senate. The *New York Herald*, in commenting upon it, declares that "Henry C. Wright, the alleged lecturer, flatly contradicts Wilson—it was not a lecture, but a meeting for discussion, publicly called." The meeting was not called, as you say it was, "to discuss a resolution affirming the right and duty of slaves to resist their masters, and the right and duty of the North to aid them in it," but it was called to hear you "lecture;" yes, sir, to hear you "lecture upon resistance to tyrants is obedience to God, in reference to the conduct of John Brown at Harper's Ferry." The principal notice for the meeting reads:—

"Rev. Henry C. Wright will lecture in School House Hall, Sunday next, at the usual hours of church service, upon the following subject:—

'Fact and Fiction in Religion, or the existence, occupation and location of the soul, after it leaves the body.'

Also in the evening, at 6½ o'clock, upon—

'Resistance to Tyrants is obedience to God, in reference to the conduct of John Brown at Harper's Ferry.'

NATICK, November 17, 1869."

In response to this notice—not to "discuss a resolution," as you assert, but to hear you "lecture"—five or six hundred people of this town assembled; not less than three hundred of the number were legal voters of the Republican and Democratic parties. They came in response to the call, to hear you lecture, and not to discuss or to act. After the meeting assembled, you took the desk, asked the meeting to appoint a chairman: the getters up of the meeting appointed

one, and you submitted a resolution. You made a long speech; no one else uttered a word; the resolution was put, and some ten or fifteen persons out of five or six hundred present voted for it. The great mass of the meeting did not vote; they looked on in silence, and declined to take any part whatever in the meeting, or to be in any degree responsible for its action. In no sense was the resolution an expression of the sentiments of the meeting, for more than nine-tenths of the persons present had no part in its action, and nine-tenths of those present, if called upon, would so state.

Mr. Willard, the editor of the *Natick Observer*, in a note to me, says: —

"I was present at the lecture delivered by Mr. Henry C. Wright on the 20th of November. I printed the notice of the meeting which was summoned to hear him lecture, and not 'called,' as he says in his letter to you, 'to discuss a resolution.' The hall was full, many prominent business men and members of the Democratic and Republican parties being present. Mr. Wright called to order, asked for a chairman, introduced the resolution, spoke one hour and forty minutes; no one else uttered a word, and it was in no sense a discussion. The vote in favor of the resolution was small, not exceeding twelve. The mass of the meeting declined to take any part in its action, or to be bound in any way by its doings. No one present could mistake your position, for your opinions are well known. A few evenings before, you had, in the same hall, and in presence of a large majority of those present, 'deplored, regretted and condemned John Brown's invasion, and all illegal and violent action by anti-slavery men,' and you declared that such acts inured to the interests of slavery. Mr. Wright's speech and his resolution seemed to me to be aimed at the position assumed in your speech in opposition to Brown's raid, and to be in opposition to your well-known opinions, and this was the opinion of many others present."

Sir, you say in your letter to me, that "a Mr. Brown asked, in an insolent tone, if you were present and countenanced the meeting;" and that, when I explained, "the slave-driver, who held the lash over you, said I am 'satisfied.'" There can be no mistaking the object of language like this. You wish to convey the impression that I do not, in the Senate, stand by my words and acts at home. Sir, you had associated my name with the sentiment, that it was "the right and duty of the North to incite slaves to resistance," and when asked by Mr. Brown, in respectful lan-

guage, tone and manner, to explain the matter, I did so by stating the true character of the meeting; and this you are pleased to denounce as "submissive"—an attempt "to deprecate the frowns and stripes of the insolent lords of the lash." This charge is base and dastardly. My words in Congress, during the past five years, are on the record. That record will show that I have never qualified, disavowed or retracted one word or act of mine out of the Senate. That record will show that I have spoken more plainly and more severely of slavery and the slave power to the face of slaveholders, in the course of debate, than I have out of the Senate, before sympathizing throngs. During the past fifteen years, I have travelled more than fifty thousand miles in seventeen States, and delivered nearly six hundred addresses to many thousands of persons. I have been connected with the public press, and have written much upon the issues growing out of the slavery question; but, at all times, and upon all occasions, in the press and before the people, in conventions and in legislative halls, at home and in Washington, I have maintained but one position—that of peaceful, legal and constitutional opposition to the extension of human slavery in America, and to its existence where the National Government is responsible for it. To this position I still adhere with inflexible firmness, and while I abhor slavery and pity the lot of the bondman, I shall not cease to remember that slavery in the States is local, not national, and that our appeals must be addressed, not to "the slaves to resist their masters," not to armed invasions, but to the reason, the heart and conscience of our countrymen of the South, upon whom rests the fearful responsibility of the slave system.

You charge me and other Senators with attempting "to throw a glamour in the eyes of Southern members"—you say that I "would have them think that 'regret and condemnation' of Brown and his objects are universal at the North," and you assert that the "masses of the North are in sympathy with Brown and his deeds." That the people of the North deeply sympathize with the personal attributes of Brown, that they admire the rare heroism of character manifested by him, no one can doubt, but that they approve of his invasion of Virginia, I do not for a moment believe.

Pending the recent election in New York, I addressed thousands of people in Brooklyn, Syracuse, Rome, Watertown, Auburn, Geneva, and other places, and during the canvass of two weeks, I everywhere expressed my "regret and condemnation" of his armed invasion of Virginia, and during that time, I conversed with no one who did not regret and deplore it. And in this State, and in this town, where you declare the people approve of Brown's lawless act, I have met few, very few indeed, who approve that act. My conviction is, that while the people of Massachusetts are nearly unanimous in their sympathy for the fate of Brown, and in their admiration of his personal qualities, they are quite unanimous in their "regret and condemnation" of his lawless raid at Harper's Ferry. Believing this to be the sentiment of the people of Massachusetts and of the North, I have so stated in public and in private. I may be mistaken in my views, but I feel confident that I am not. If I am mistaken, if the time has come when the liberty-loving and law-abiding people of Massachusetts are convinced—as you assume they are—that "it is the right and duty of the North to incite slaves to resistance, and to aid them in it"—that it is the right and duty of Northern men to gather in armed bands to invade slaveholding States, "to incite slaves to resistance, and to aid them in it"—then I am not the representative of their sentiments and opinions. Within the Union and under the Constitution, I shall, in the future as in the past, in public and in private life, give my voice and vote for just and peaceful legal and constitutional action against slavery. This is my position. I believe it to be the position of a vast majority of the people whose representative I am. When Massachusetts abandons this policy of peaceful, legal and constitutional reform, which patriotism, humanity and religion sanction, and accepts your policy of "insurrection"—when she requires me to uphold the doctrine that "it is their right and duty to incite slaves to resistance," and to organize armed bands and invade sister States "to aid them in it"—there will be a vacant chair for her to fill in the Senate of the United States.

HENRY WILSON.